REMARKS

In the present communication, Claims 1, 6, 7, and 10 have been amended, and Claims 11 and 16-20 have been cancelled. As such, Claims 1-10 and 12-15 are currently pending. The Examiner's comments regarding prosecution and pending rejections are as follows:

I) The Examiner restricted the claims into two groups; and

II) Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly non-enabled.

I. Restriction Requirement

The Examiner restricted the claims into two groups: Group I (Claims 1-15) directed toward carbohydrate encapsulated nanoparticles, and Group II (Claims 16-20) directed toward methods of detecting a target in a sample. Applicants orally elected Group I without traverse. Applicants hereby confirm the election of Group I without traverse. Applicants have cancelled the non-elected claims of Group II (Claims 16-20).

II. Enablement Rejection

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as allegedly not enabled. In particular, the Examiner alleged that the specification:

> while being enabling for mannose molecules or mannose derivative molecules and gold as the core metallic nanoparticle, does not reasonably provide enablement for all other carbohydrates [that] can be used as coating or all possible metals that can be formed into nanoparticles. (Office Action, page 4).

Applicants disagree with this rejection and submit that the claims are fully enabled for more than just gold as the core nanoparticle and for more than just mannose or mannose derivatives as the carbohydrate.

In regard to the core nanoparticle, for business reasons, in order to further prosecution of the present application, without acquiescing to the Examiner's rejection, and while reserving the right to prosecute the same or similar claims in the future, Applicants have amended the claims. In particular, Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite that the core nanoparticle comprises gold. As such, the Examiner's rejection with respect to the core nanoparticle is moot as the Examiner has admitted that the claims are enabled for gold core nanoparticles. Applicants note that the size of the gold core nanoparticle has been amended in Claim 1 to specify a diameter of

4-20 nanometers. Support for this amendment is found throughout the specification including, page 4, lines 23-25, Example 9 (e.g., Table 3), and Example 10.

In regard to the carbohydrate limitation, the Examiner asserts that the claims should be limited to mannose as the specification allegedly only provides Examples employing mannose. In particular, the Examiner states:

> Applicants in the specification describes by way of examples carbohydrate coated metal particles wherein the preferred carbohydrate is mannose or mannose derivative molecules and the preferred metal is gold. (Office Action, page 4).

Applicants respectfully point out that the specification provides more than just Examples employing mannose. Indeed, the present specification contains Examples employing *four* different exemplary types of carbohydrates as listed below:

mannose - Example 4, pages 35-36.
globotriose (pK antigen) - Example 8, pages 39-43.
glucose - Example 10, pages 45-54.
galactose - Example 10, pages 45-54.

These examples provide evidence that one of skill in the art could practice the claimed invention with many different types of carbohydrates. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims, as amended, are fully enabled and request that the enablement rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the arguments and claim amendments set forth above traverse the Examiner's rejections and, therefore, request that the rejection be withdrawn for the reasons set forth above. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would aid in the prosecution of this application, the Applicants encourage the Examiner to call the undersigned collect at 608-218-6900.

Dated: 01/31/07

Jason R. Bond
Registration No. 45,439
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP
101 Howard Street, Suite 350
San Francisco, California 94105
608/218-6900